	Case 1:20-cv-00858-ADA-CDB	Document 55 Filed 11/03/22 Page 1 of 2
1		
1		
2 3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	WILLIAM J. GRADFORD,	No. 1:20-cv-00858-ADA-BAM (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
13	v.	RECOMMENDATIONS, GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS, AND
14	DEPUTY BAEZ,	DISMISSING ACTION WITH PREJUDICE
15	Defendant.	(ECF Nos. 32, 42)
16		ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST
17		FOR VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL
18		(ECF No. 53)
19 20		ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO
21		TERMINATE ALL PENDING MOTIONS AND CLOSE THE CASE
22		
23	Plaintiff William J. Gradford	d is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis
24	in this civil rights action filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United	
25	States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
26	On February 3, 2022, Defendant filed a motion to enforce a settlement agreement entered	
27	into by the parties and to dismiss pursuant to a release and discharge signed by Plaintiff on	
28	///	

## Case 1:20-cv-00858-ADA-CDB Document 55 Filed 11/03/22 Page 2 of 2

May 7, 2019. (ECF No. 32.) Plaintiff filed a response in opposition. (ECF No. 35.)

On August 26, 2022, the then-assigned United States Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations to grant Defendant's motion for an order enforcing settlement and to dismiss this case with prejudice. (ECF No. 42.) Plaintiff filed four sets of objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF Nos. 43, 45, 46, 50.) In his objections, Plaintiff references other cases and argues there are "many errors" in the settlement agreement. Plaintiff's objections are not supported by the record and fail to demonstrate the findings and recommendations are erroneous.

On September 29, 2022, Plaintiff filed a request to voluntarily dismiss this case. (ECF No. 32.) Because this case is dismissed on Defendant's motion, Plaintiff's request for voluntary dismissal is moot. Moreover, Plaintiff has failed to submit a stipulation signed by the parties, and the Court has determined that this action must be dismissed with prejudice on the merits. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a). Therefore, Plaintiff's request for voluntary dismissal is denied.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations issued on August 26, 2022 (ECF No. 42), are adopted in full;
- 2. Defendant's motion for an order enforcing the parties' settlement agreement and dismissing the case, (ECF No. 32), is GRANTED;
- 3. Plaintiff's request for voluntary dismissal (ECF No. 53), is DENIED;
- 4. This action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE:
- 5. The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate all pending motions and close the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 2, 2022

UNITED &TATES DISTRICT JUDGE